

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In re:

STREAM TV NETWORKS, INC., *et al.*,

Debtors.

Chapter 11

Case No. 23-10763 (MDC)

STREAM TV NETWORKS, INC. and
TECHNOVATIVE MEDIA, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SHADRON L. STASTNEY, SLS HOLDINGS
VI, LLC, HAWK INVESTMENT HOLDINGS
LIMITED, ARTHUR LEONARD ROBERT
“BOB” MORTON, SEECUBIC, INC.,
ALASTAIR CRAWFORD, KRZYSZTOF
KABACINSKI, KEVIN GOLLOP, ASAF
GOLA, JOHN DOE(S),

Defendants.

Adv. Case No. 23-00057 (MDC)

ORDER

AND NOW, on October 9, 2023, the above-captioned Debtors, Stream TV Networks, Inc. (“Stream”) and Technovative Media, Inc. (“Technovative,” and together with Stream, the “Debtors”) filed the *Debtors’ Motion to Reduce the Period to Produce Requested Documents in Connection with Debtors’ Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction, and Permanent Injunction* (the “Motion”).¹

AND, by the Motion, the Debtors seek an order compelling the above-captioned Defendants to produce documents pursuant to certain document requests (the “Document

¹ Bankr. Docket No. 54.

Requests”) on or before October 12, 2023, at 12:00 p.m.²

AND, upon consideration of the Motion, it is hereby **ORDERED** and **DETERMINED** that:

1. The Motion is **DENIED**.

2. Requests for expedited discovery are analyzed according to a good cause standard. Courts commonly consider the following factors: (1) whether a preliminary injunction is pending; (2) the breadth of the requests; (3) the purposes for requesting the expedited discovery; (4) the burden on the defendants to comply with the requests; and (5) how far in advance of the typical discovery process the request was made. *See, e.g., American Legalnet, Inc. v. Davis*, 673 F.Supp.2d 1063, 1067 (C.D. Cal. 2009) (citing, *inter alia*, *Disability Rights Council of Greater Wash. v. Wash. Metro. Area Transit Auth.*, 234 F.R.D. 4 (D.D.C. 2006), which in turn cited *Entm’t Tech. Corp. v. Walt Disney Imagineering*, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19832 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 2, 2003)).

3. Here, applying the above factors, the Debtors have not established that expedited discovery is warranted. First, no preliminary injunction is pending. Rather, the Debtors are seeking the expedited discovery in connection with the continued hearing on their temporary restraining order request. Second, the Document Requests are extremely broad and seek documents and communications related to 11 expansive categories. Third, the burden on the Defendants to comply with the Document Requests is extraordinarily high given their broad nature. Finally, the 48-hour response time sought is markedly shorter than the typical 30-day response deadline provided for under the applicable federal rules. *See* F.R.B.P. 7034 and F.R.C.P. 34(b)(2)(A).

4. Because the Debtors have not established good cause, grounds do not

² The Document Requests were filed separately from the Motion at Bankr. Docket No. 53.

exist to grant the Motion.

Dated: October 11, 2023

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Magdelaine D. Coleman". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

MAGDELINE D. COLEMAN
CHIEF UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE